May 14, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: James D. Smith, Environmental Scientist

RE: 2002, Second Quarter Water Monitoring, Genwal Resources, Inc., Crandall Canyon Mine, C/015/032-WQ02-2

1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [X] NO [ ]
Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.
See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Resampling due date

Renewal submittal due 01/13/2003, renewal due 05/13/2003. The last mid-term review commenced on 10/24/2000 and was completed 10/05/2001. Analyses for parameters on the "extended" parameter lists (baseline) in the MRP were performed in 1990, 1995, 2000 and are to be done thereafter at five-year intervals - during low-flow (fourth quarter) - until surety bond is released: the next baseline analyses will be done in 2005.

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES [X] NO [ ]
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

4. Were irregularities found in the data? YES [X] NO [ ]
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

BCF: water temperature (n = 22) was outside the two standard deviation range;

Horse Canyon: water temperature (n = 24) was outside the two standard deviation range;

LOF-1: field conductivity (n = 74), sulfate (n = 78), and TDS (n = 102) were outside the two standard deviation range;

MW-7: bicarbonate (n = 15), Ca (n = 10), Mg (n = 10), K (n = 10), Na (n = 10), sulfate (n = 14), total alkalinity (n = 15), and total hardness (n = 15) were outside the two standard deviation range;

SP1-19: flow (n = 23) was outside the two standard deviation range;

UPF-1: April 1 sample; DO (n = 51) and field conductivity (n = 70) were outside the two standard deviation range;

UPF-1: June 8 sample; Ca (n = 16), Mg (n = 16), water temperature (n = 67), field conductivity (n = 70), sulfate (n = 75), total anions (not a required parameter; n = 60), total cations (not a required parameter; n = 60), TDS (n = 100), and total hardness (n = 76) were outside the two standard deviation range;

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [X] NO [ ]
2nd month, YES [X] NO [ ]
Identify sites and months not monitored: 3rd month, YES [X] NO [ ]

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported? YES [ ] NO [X]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

UPDES UT0024368-002 for April and May: Oil and Grease analysis result was not reported to the Division;

UPDES UT0024368-002 April, May, and June: "floating solids or visible foam" and "sanitary waste discharge assessment" were not reported to the Division.

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data? YES [X] NO [ ]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

The Permittee needs to provide the Oil and Grease analysis result at UPDES UT0024368-002 for April and May;

The Permittee needs to provide the "floating solids or visible foam" and "sanitary waste discharge assessment" at UPDES UT0024368-002 for April, May, and June.

The Permittee needs to check the calibration on the DO meter, specific conductivity meter, and thermometer.

As there were numerous parameters outside the two standard deviation range, the Division and Permittee need to monitor for trends.

an
O:\015032.CRA\WATER QUALITY\JDSWQ_02-2.DOC